



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| 10/043,719 | 01/09/2002 | Piotr Jozef Drozdewicz | 7257/75(a) | 6462 |
| 29855 7590 01/17/2007 WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH, RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, L.L.P. 20333 SH 249 SUITE 600 HOUSTON, TX 77070 | | | EXAMINER JEAN GILLES, JUDE | |
| | | | ART UNIT 2143 | PAPER NUMBER |
| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| 3 MONTHS | | | 01/17/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/043,719

Applicant(s)

DROZDZEWICZ ET AL.

Examiner

Jude J. Jean-Gilles

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19-24.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to Reply communication filed on 10/23/2006.

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-18 and 25-26 are cancelled. Claims 19-24 are pending. Claim 19 has been amended. Claims 19-24 represent an internet based conference provision method that involves "delivering unique URL and set time through Internet from a web browser of subscriber to each participant".

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's Request for Reconsideration filed on 10/23/2006 has been carefully considered but is not deemed fully persuasive. However, because there exists the likelihood of future presentation of this argument, the Examiner thinks that it is prudent to address Applicants' main points of contention.

A. Claim 19 was amended to include the limitation:

"in response to the subscriber delivering the unique URL through the Internet to the participant and the participant clicking on the delivered URL, having the conference system obtain a telephone number of the participant from the participant"

and that the prior art of record Jonsson does not disclose the above limitation.

B. Applicant contends that Claim 19 was also amended to include the limitation:

"having the conferencing system automatically dial the telephone

number and connect the participant to the conferencing system"

and that Jonsson does not teach this limitation. The Office Action stated that Jonsson teaches "having the conferencing system automatically connect the participant to the conferencing system in response to the provided identification information," citing Jonsson column 1, lines 61-67; column 2 lines 1-12; column 4, lines 1-26; column 5, lines 39-52; and column 6, lines 9-27.

As to "Point A" it is the position of the Examiner that Jonsson in detail teaches the limitations of the above mentioned claims. However, in view of Applicant's remarks, New prior of Doganata is used in combination to Jonsson to reject independent claim 19 and subsequently all its dependent claims [see *Doganata, abstract; also see fig. 5, items 564, 565 and 566; also, see column 3, lines 3-12; note that the Doganata teaches "the conference service provider receives the telephone numbers of the participants over the established data connection and starts dialing out to the participants"*].

As to point B, see point A above.

Examiner notes with delight that no new matter has been added and that the new claims are supported by the application as filed. However, applicant has failed in presenting claims and drawings that delineate the contours of this invention as compared to the cited prior art. Applicant has failed to clearly point out patentable novelty in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited that would

overcome the 103(a) rejections applied against the claims, the rejection is therefore sustained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 19-23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson (hereinafter Jonsson), Patent No. 6,272,214 B1 in view of Doganata et al. (hereinafter Doganata), U.S. Patent No. 6,798,753 B1.

Regarding **claim 19**, Jonsson discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Jonsson disclose a method for establishing a conference between a subscriber and a participant, the method utilizing a conferencing system and an Internet and comprising:

assigning a unique URL for the conference (column 3; lines 3-47);

in response to the subscriber delivering the unique URL through the Internet to the participant and the participant clicking on the delivered URL (column 3, lines 3-46), having the conference system obtain a telephone number of the participant from the participant; and

having the conferencing system automatically dial the telephone number and connect the participant to the conferencing system (see abstract; see column 1, lines

Art Unit: 2143

61-67, and column 2, lines 1-12; column 4, lines 1-26; column 5, lines 39-52; column 6, lines 9-27).

In the Reply filed on 1/23/2006, applicants argue that Jonsson does not disclose the details of having the conference system obtain a telephone number of the participant from the participant, and having the conferencing system automatically dial the telephone number.

In the same field of endeavor, Doganata discloses a (...*"The conference service provider receives the telephone numbers of the participants over the established data connection and starts dialing out to the participants. When the participants answer, they are all connected to the audio bridge in order to establish an audio conference. In one modification of the invention, the service provider returns a dial-in number and a password, upon request, to be distributed to the participants, so that any users who are unable to provide a dial-out number in advance may dial in to the scheduled conference ..."*) [see *Doganata*, abstract; also see fig. 5, items 564, 565 and 566; also, see column 3, lines 3-12].

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated *Doganata*'s teachings of a method and apparatus for having the conference system obtain a telephone number of the participant from the participant, and having the conferencing system automatically dial the telephone number with the teachings of Jonsson, for the purpose of "*providing a method for collecting conference set up information from the user and/or automatically*

from the existing desktop office applications " as stated by *Doganata* in lines 12-18 of column 2. By this rationale **claim 19** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 20**, the combination Jonsson- Doganata teaches the method of claim 19 wherein providing the unique URL occurs by emailing the unique URL through the Internet to the subscriber (column 3, lines 16-28; column 5, lines 7-38).

Regarding **claim 21**, the combination Jonsson- Doganata discloses the method of claim 19 wherein providing the unique URL comprises placing the unique URL on a web page such that the subscriber can copy the unique URL to the web browser of the subscriber (column 3, lines 16-28; column 5, lines 7-38).

Regarding **claim 22**, the combination Jonsson- Doganata discloses the method of claim 19 wherein the subscriber delivering the unique URL through the Internet to the participant by the subscriber emailing the unique URL to the participant (column 3, lines 16-28; column 5, lines 7-38).

Regarding **claim 23**, the combination Jonsson- Doganata discloses the method of claim 19 wherein the subscriber delivering the unique URL through the Internet to the participant occurs by the subscriber placing the unique URL on a web page so that the participant can copy the URL to a web browser of each of the participant (column 3, lines 16-28; column 5, lines 7-38; column 6, lines 8-26).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claim 24** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Jonsson and Doganata as stated in claim 19 above, in further view of Elliott et al

(Elliott), U.S. Patent No: 6,690,654 B2.

Regarding **claim 24**, The combination Jonsson- Doganata teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Jonsson- Doganata fully discloses the method for establishing a conference between a subscriber and a participant of claim 19. However, Jonsson- Doganata fails to specifically teach a method for establishing a conference wherein the URL is a graphical icon.

In the same field of endeavor, Elliott discloses a method in which "... a URL push button (e.g. icon) that is provided ... and a agent that clicks the push button URL to open a browser's URL to the client..... " [see Elliott, *column 7, lines 13-25*].

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Elliott's teachings of a URL as a graphical icon, with the teachings of Jonsson, for the purpose of "*allowing a mixture of modes including participation through for example, the Internet....*" as stated by Jonsson in lines 23-26 of column 2. Elliott also provides motivation to combine by stating "to provide enhanced customer services, product support, technical support, sales services, training, and other business services..." in column 1, lines 44-48. By this rationale **claim 24** is rejected.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from examiner should be directed to Jude Jean-Gilles whose telephone number is (571) 272-3914. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley, can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2143

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-9000.

Jude Jean-Gilles

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2143

JJG

January, 06 2006



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISOR, PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100